

LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE

DATE: December 5, 2007

CALLED TO ORDER: 5:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED: 5:18 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

ATTENDING MEMBERS

Lonnell Conley, Chairman
Ron Gibson
Dane Mahern
Lynn McWhirter
William Oliver
Marilyn Pfisterer
Lincoln Plowman
Joanne Sanders

ABSENT MEMBERS

Sherron Franklin

AGENDA

PROPOSAL NO. 535, 2007 - dissolves certain law enforcement consolidation transition committees in favor of the establishment of the metropolitan law enforcement advisory council provided by existing ordinances
"Do Pass" Vote: 8-0

LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE

The Law Enforcement Consolidation Committee of the City-County Council met on Wednesday, December 5, 2007. Chairman Lonnell Conley called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. with the following members present: Ron Gibson, Dane Mahern, Lynn McWhirter, William Oliver, Marilyn Pfisterer, Lincoln Plowman and Joanne Sanders. Sherron Franklin was absent. General Counsel Aaron Haith was also in attendance.

PROPOSAL NO. 535, 2007 - dissolves certain law enforcement consolidation transition committees in favor of the establishment of the metropolitan law enforcement advisory council provided by existing ordinances

Suzannah Wilson-Overholt, Indianapolis Works Transition Director, provided a handout (attached as Exhibit A) with a report on the 2007 consolidation efforts. She said that she will not go into the details included in this memorandum, but stated that the Transition Authority has been called upon very little to handle conflicts or hammer out details since the merger, which is an indication that the consolidation has run fairly smoothly. She said that this report dovetails into the submitted Proposal No. 535, 2007. She said that the proposal will eliminate the Transition Authority, as well as the advisory and steering committees, which have not met at all this year. The original merger ordinance states that the Council will, after December 1, 2007, vote to terminate these transition bodies. This proposal will start the process to dissolve the Authority and its two committees.

Councillor Pfisterer said that there has been a lot of speculation regarding transitioning the authority for the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) back under the Mayor, with the new administration. She asked if there is any legal reason not to dissolve the committees until that issue is resolved. Ms. Overholt stated that she cannot speak to the legalities of that, but the ordinance approving the merger simply calls for the dissolution of these entities. Aaron Haith, General Counsel, stated that these transition bodies would not be needed for the purposes Councillor Pfisterer is suggesting, and this proposal simply completes the requirements of the original ordinance. Councillor Pfisterer asked if these committees were only needed to help with the transition. Mr. Haith answered in the affirmative.

Councillor McWhirter said that the consolidation ordinance states that the Council will take steps to dissolve these bodies "on or after" December 1, 2007, and she asked if any date after December 1 would work, and therefore, if action could be delayed. Mr. Haith said that a later date would work, as long as action is taken this year. Councillor McWhirter asked if it is required that the committees be dissolved this year. Mr. Haith said that this is correct. Councillor McWhirter asked what the next step is once these

bodies are dissolved and what takes the place of these advisory committees. Mr. Haith said that the answer can be found in the second section of Proposal No. 535, 2007. Ms. Overholt said that a Law Enforcement Advisory Council is created immediately after the dissolution of these committees and the Transition Authority. Councillor McWhirter asked who will serve on the new Advisory Council. Ms. Overholt stated that the members are outlined in Sec. 279-207 of the original ordinance to include, at minimum, eight members. One of those members would be the Sheriff, and one would be the Public Safety Director. One would be appointed by the Mayor, and five would be appointed by the Council. The Council appointees would include two general members, not of the same party, and three more members who would each have expertise in one of the following areas: public safety, management, and municipal finance and budgeting. Councillor McWhirter asked since these individuals have not yet been appointed, would there be a gap in coverage. Mr. Haith said that there might be about a month gap, but these individuals simply serve in an advisory capacity and have no authority over the day-to-day operations, so there should not be a problem. Ms. Overholt stated that the current Authority and these two committees do not have any daily oversight on the department either.

Councillor Sanders asked if this report, which is dated November 19, 2007 (Exhibit A), has been publicized. Ms. Overholt stated that a Transition Authority meeting was scheduled for November 19, 2007, at which this report would have been distributed, but that meeting was cancelled. She said that the report is a matter of public record. Councillor Sanders said that she would like to see the report made available, possibly as a link on the City's website. Councillor Gibson stated that adding the report to the minutes of this Committee meeting will also help to make it public.

Councillor Oliver said that he would like a copy of the new beat map and an organizational chart. Ms. Overholt said that the maps have not changed, but she can provide Councillor Oliver with the latest copies.

Councillor Sanders said that there have been some questions about the inequity between the Indianapolis Police Department (IPD) and Marion County Sheriff's Department (MCSD) appointments to positions of authority during the transition. She asked Ms. Overholt to speak to this issue. Ms. Overholt said that in developing command staff, the Sheriff and IPD Chief paid close attention to current ranks within both groups. She said that there was a fairly even and proportionate distribution of authority positions, although it may have seemed that there were more for IPD officers, because the Sheriff's Department did not have the merit rank of Captain. Councillor Sanders asked if this is the reason command staff positions seemed heavy on former IPD officers. Ms. Overholt answered in the affirmative.

Chairman Conley called for public testimony. Robert Yahara, citizen, thanked Ms. Overholt, other staff and Council members for their efforts to maintain law and authority throughout the entire County. He stated that there are still decisions ahead that will affect the consolidation, and those making these decisions are in his prayers.

Councillor Oliver stated that he would like to get a list of all the command staff. Ms. Overholt said that she can get Councillor Oliver a current organizational chart, which includes this information.

Councillor Gibson moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to send Proposal No. 535, 2007 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

Chairman Conley thanked all the members for serving on this committee during its existence. He said that it has been a pleasure serving with each member, and he wished everyone a safe and wonderful holiday and much success in future endeavors.

There being no further business, and upon motion duly made, the meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lonnell Conley, Chairman

LC/ag

MEMORANDUM

EXHIBIT A

To: Members, Law Enforcement Consolidation Transition Authority
Mayor Peterson, Sheriff Anderson, Council President Gray
From: Suzannah Wilson Overholt, Indianapolis Works Transition Director
CC: Kevin Murray, Aaron Haith, Kobi Wright, Robert Clifford, Chief Michael Spears, Jerry McCory
Date: November 19, 2007
Re: Report on 2007 Consolidation Efforts

On December 19, 2005, the City-County Council approved merging IPD and the county police force of MCSO effective January 1, 2007 (General Ordinance No. 110, 2005). The new department is the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD).

Public Law 227-2005, which authorized the merger of the Indianapolis Police Department (IPD) and the county police force of the Marion County Sheriff's Department (MCSO), states: "The executive of the consolidated city shall provide for an independent evaluation and performance audit" of the consolidation. The following report is intended to provide background information for the statutorily required evaluation and audit, which will be conducted by Katz Sapper & Miller.

The audit is required to address cost savings, operational efficiencies, improved service levels, and tax shifts among taxpayers. The following summarizes the achievements in each of those areas this year.

Operational efficiencies and improved service levels

- **Oversight and Chain of Command**

- The ordinance approving the merger placed IMPD under the control of the Sheriff.
 - This model differed from what the Mayor proposed as part of Indianapolis Works, which recommended that the new department under the control of a commission.
 - After announcing the proposed merger and receiving input from various groups, the stakeholders (Mayor, Council and Sheriff) agreed that the new department should be under the Sheriff's control since he is the county's top elected law enforcement official.
 - Having the department under the Sheriff has allowed for even further streamlining of administrative functions. Had IMPD been put under the Mayor's control, there would still need to be two separate administrative staffs since MCSO would exist regardless of the merger, resulting in unnecessary costs for taxpayers.
- The Transition Authority was created to plan the merger and to decide central transition questions. The Authority does not have input into or any responsibility for the daily law enforcement operations of IMPD. Rather, the daily operations are the responsibility of the Sheriff, through the Chief.
- Upon the Council's dissolution of the Authority, the Law Enforcement Advisory Council (LEAC) is created and is responsible for reviewing planning, operations,

and fiscal matters; receiving citizen input; and making recommendations to the Sheriff and Chief on matters of priority and policy. The LEAC consists of seven members, including the Sheriff, two Councilors, a Mayoral appointee and three individuals appointed by the Council. Like the Authority, the LEAC has no input into or responsibility for the daily operations of IMPD.

- IMPD is under the direction of the Chief, who is appointed by the Sheriff, subject to Council confirmation and approval by the Mayor. The Chief serves at the pleasure of the Sheriff.

- **Staffing**

- The command staff in place on January 1, 2007, resulted in a net reduction of approximately 30 command positions between the two departments. In addition, during 2007, Chief Spears developed a plan to eliminate one major, one captain, 35 lieutenant and 40 sergeant positions through attrition. 41 of these positions will be vacated by the end of 2007. These changes will result in more patrol officers on the street. Organizational charts for each unit and the command structure are available for review.
 - In August 2007, the Sheriff and Chief Spears announced plans to consolidate IMPD and MCSD administrative functions within MCSD. Many of the positions that were held by sworn personnel are now filled by civilians, allowing sworn officers to return to law enforcement duties. Those positions are all filled by MCSD employees. IMPD no longer has its own administrative staff.
- The merger has already put more officers on the street.
 - On the effective date, there were already 49 additional officers patrolling the streets as a result of efficiencies achieved with the merger.
 - By the end of 2007, there will be a net increase of approximately 70 officers patrolling the streets since the merger.
 - In October, IMPD swore in the largest recruit class in the city's history in order to achieve the Mayor's goal of adding 100 officers to the force in 2008.
 - IMPD's authorized strength will be a record high of 1740 sworn officers on January 1, 2008, and the budget allows for accelerated hiring and training of those officers.

- **Response times**

- The merger eliminated the squiggly line that divided the old IPD and MCSD jurisdictions. The immediate benefit of this change is that officers needing back up are assisted by the closest officer. Before the merger, if the closest officer was with the other department, that officer was not necessarily called upon to respond. A map showing the new jurisdictions is available for review.
- In addition, twenty-two new beats were added to the consolidated city, with the most obvious impact being smaller beats in what had been the Sheriff's jurisdiction. The new beat map is available for review.
- Average response times have decreased since the merger.

- Just before the merger, IPD's average response time for all runs was 7 minutes 17 seconds while MCSD's average was 8 minutes 57 seconds. Between the two departments, the average response time for all runs was 8 minutes 7 seconds.
 - Immediately after the merger, the average response time for all runs was 7 minutes 58 seconds.
 - In March, run times were broken down by priority runs and all runs. At that time, the average response time for priority runs was 6 minutes 45 seconds and the average time for all runs was 7 minutes 50 seconds.
 - As of September, the average response time for priority runs was down to 6 minutes 29 seconds and the average response time for all runs was down to 7 minutes 38 seconds. The response times appear to have leveled off at this point. A report detailing monthly response times and calls for service is available for review.
- **Enhanced crime fighting efforts**
 - Additional overtime: Patrol Districts throughout the city have been allotted 120 hours of overtime per week to assign the most effective and productive officers in high crime areas to interdict guns, drugs, suspects wanted in crimes, and to increase visibility.
 - Street Level Enforcement Detail (SLED) continues and its size is being expanded (almost 2,000 arrests in 2007 with over 25% felonies). SLED teams have also been developed within the Districts and conduct saturation patrols of "hot spots."
 - Community policing: With increased field personnel, officers have more time to devote to walking patrols and interaction with neighborhoods and businesses.
 - Officers have been directed to check all abandoned homes and buildings within the city.
 - Bicycle patrols are used as needed (Monon Trail, special events, some neighborhood patrols).
 - Officers have been asked to pay closer attention to schools, bus stops, parks and other areas frequented by youth.
 - Partnerships with other agencies: Additional funding and personnel allow the IMPD to extend its work in crime reduction by partnering with many county, state, and federal agencies.
 - Work within the Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership (IVRP) continues and IMPD's ability to participate and cooperate in multi-agency initiatives and task forces is increased.
 - In October, IMPD created a violent crime unit in partnership with the IVRP to target the most wanted criminals in Marion County.
 - Crime analysis: Increased amounts of "real time" data are provided to commanders and officers to better plan and direct patrols, investigations, and enforcement measures.

- The IMPD has developed its own “Compstat” program modeled after those of other departments which have experienced success within their jurisdictions.
 - Commanders are responsible for regular presentations in which they must account for crime within their assignment. They must outline strategies and patrol and investigative plans to respond to crime.
- Curfew sweeps throughout the city have been increased. These sweeps have proven to be helpful in keeping young persons off the streets and away from the hazards and lure of some crimes.
- Narcotics and gun interdiction investigations and enforcement have been increased and continue to be a priority within the Districts and the Criminal Investigations Division. IMPD’s Narcotics Interdiction Unit within the Criminal Investigations Division also directs its work to areas and neighborhoods experiencing the highest amount of narcotics activity.
- Youth programs: IMPD has expanded its outreach to at risk children through its Youth Services programs including:
 - “Our Kids” (OK) Program;
 - PAL (seasonal sports, computer classes, gang resistance training, NASA Challenger Camp, etc.); and
 - Good Touch-Bad Touch Program.
- **Crime Rate** (reports detailing crime statistics are available for review)
 - Crime trends in 2007 show progress in several areas and the need for improvement in others.
 - Overall crime was up by .67% (through July 2007).
 - Statistics for January through July 2007 for specific types of crime:
 - Vehicle Theft: -13.98%
 - Larceny: -4.85%
 - Business Burglary: -15.9%
 - Rape: -5.2%
 - Robbery: +24.47%
 - Aggravated Assault +30.99%
 - Residence Burglary: +17.98%
 - Homicide rate: -26% from 2006 (through August 29, 2007)
- **Solve Rate** (reports detailing crime statistics are available for review)
 - The rate at which crimes are solved has improved since the merger.
 - As of July 2007, the solve rate was 20.81%. At the same time in 2006, the solve rate was 18.45%.

Cost Savings

Based upon the actual 2007 budgets for IMPD and MCSD compared to the 2006 budgets of IPD and MCSD, the merger saved \$7.4 million in 2007. These savings stem from the operational efficiencies outlined above and the general budgetary efficiencies gained by eliminating budgetary redundancies between the two departments. The budgets and detailed savings analysis are available for review. Greater savings are expected in 2008 due to further reductions in administrative staff.

Tax shifts

There were no tax shifts among taxpayers in 2007. There were budgetary transfers between the departments but the tax base was not affected.